

Oxford Democrat.

No. 1, Vol. 4, New Series.

Paris, Maine, Tuesday, May 14, 1844.

Old Series, No. 11, Vol. 13.

OXFORD DEMOCRAT,

PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY

George W. Elwell,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS:—One Dollar and Fifty cents in advance. Advertisements inserted on reasonable terms. The Proprietor not being accountable for any error beyond the amount charged for the advertisement. A reasonable deduction will be made for cash in advance, and no credit will be given for a longer period than three months.

Communications and Letters on business must be Post-Paid to insure attention.

Book and Job Printing

Executed with neatness and despatch.

Mr. Clay on Texas.

RALPH, April 17, 1844.

Gentlemen:—Subsequently to my departure from Ashland, in December last, I received various communications from popular assemblies and private individuals, requesting an expression of my opinion upon the question of the annexation of Texas to the United States. I have forborne to reply to them, because it was not very convenient, during the progress of my journey, to do so, and for other reasons. I did not think it proper, unnecessarily, to introduce at present a new element among the other existing subjects which agitate and engross the public mind. The rejection of the overture of Texas, some years ago, to become annexed to the U. States, had met with general acquiescence. Nothing had since occurred materially to vary the question. I had seen no evidence of a desire being entertained, on the part of any considerable portion of the American people, that Texas should become an integral part of the United States. During my sojourn in New Orleans, I had, indeed, been greatly surprised, by information which I received from Texas, that, in the course of last fall, a voluntary overture had proceeded from the Executive of the United States to the Authorities of Texas to conclude a Treaty of Annexation; and that, in order to overcome the repugnance felt by any of them to a negotiation upon the subject, strong, and, as I believed, erroneous representations had been made to them of a state of opinion in the Senate of the United States favorable to the ratification of such a treaty. According to these representations, it had been ascertained that a number of Senators, varying from thirty-five to forty-two, were ready to sanction such a treaty. I was aware, too, that holders of Texas lands and Texas scrip, and speculators in them, were actively engaged in promoting the object of annexation. Still, I did not believe that any Executive of the United States would venture upon so grave and momentous a proceeding, not only without any general manifestation of public opinion in favor of it, but in direct opposition to strong and decided expressions of public disapprobation. But it appears that I was mistaken. To the astonishment of the whole nation, we are now informed that a treaty of annexation has been actually concluded, and is to be submitted to the Senate for its consideration. The motives for my silence, therefore no longer remain, and I feel it to be my duty to present an exposition of my views and opinions upon the question, for what they may be worth, to the public consideration. I adopt this method as being more convenient than several replies to the respective communications which I have received.

I regret that I have not the advantage of a view of the treaty itself, so as to enable me to adopt an expression of my opinion to the actual conditions and stipulations which it contains. Not possessing that opportunity, I am constrained to treat the question according to what I presume to be the terms of the treaty. If, without the loss of national character, without the hazard of foreign war, with the general concurrence of the nation, and without giving an unreasonable price for Texas, the question of annexation were presented, it would appear in quite a different light from that in which, I apprehend, it is now to be regarded.

The United States acquired a title to Texas, extending, as I believe, to the Rio del Norte, by the treaty of Louisiana. They ceded and relinquished that title to Spain by the treaty of 1800, by which the Sabine was substituted for the Rio del Norte as our western boundary. This treaty was negotiated under the Administration of Mr. Monroe, and with the concurrence of his Cabinet, of which Messrs. Crawford, Calhoun, and Wirt, being a majority, all Southern gentlemen, composed a part. When the treaty was laid before the House of Representatives, being a member of that body, I expressed the opinion, which I then entertained, and still hold, that Texas was sacrificed to the acquisition of Florida. We wanted Florida; but I thought it must, from its position, inevitably fall into our possession; that of no sort of consequence, and that in giving five millions of dollars and Texas for it, we gave more than a just equivalent. But, if we made a great sacrifice in the surrender of Texas, we ought to take care not to make too great a sacrifice in the attempt to re-acquire it.

My opinions of the inexpediency of the treaty of 1810 did not prevail. The country and Congress were satisfied with it, appropriations were made to carry it into effect, the line of the Sabine was recognised by us as our boundary, in negotiations both with Spain and Mexico, after Mexico became independent, and measures have been in actual progress to mark the line, from the Sabine to Red river, and thence to the Pacific ocean. We have thus fairly alienated our title to Texas, by solemn national compacts, to the fulfilment of which we stand bound by good faith and nation-

al honor. It is, therefore, perfectly idle and ridiculous, if not dishonorable, to talk of resuming our title to Texas, as if we had never parted with it. We can no more do that than Spain can resume Florida, France Louisiana, or Great Britain the thirteen colonies, now composing a part of the United States.

During the administration of Mr. Adams, Mr. Poinsett, Minister of the United States at Mexico, was instructed by me, with the President's authority, to propose a re-purchase of Texas; but he forebore even to make an overture for that purpose. Upon his return to the United States, he informed me, at New Orleans, that his reason for making it was, that he knew the purchase was wholly impracticable, and that he was persuaded that, if he made the overture, it would have no other effect than to aggravate irritations, already existing, upon matters of difference between the two countries.

The events which have since transpired in Texas are well known. She revolted against the Government of Mexico, slew to arms, and finally fought and won the memorable battle of San Jacinto, annihilating a Mexican army and making a captive of the Mexican President. The signal success of that Revolution was greatly aided, if not wholly achieved, by citizens of the United States who had migrated to Texas. These successors, if they could not always be prevented by the Government of the United States, were furnished in a manner and to an extent which brought upon us some national reproach in the eyes of an impartial world. And, in my opinion, they imposed on us the obligation of scrupulously avoiding the imputation of having instigated and aided the Revolution with the ultimate view of territorial aggrandizement. After the battle of San Jacinto, the United States recognised the independence of Texas, in conformity with the principle and practice which have always prevailed in their councils of recognising the Government "de facto," without regarding the question "de jure." That recognition did not affect or impair the rights of Mexico, or change the relations which existed between her and Texas. She, on the contrary, has preserved all her rights, and has continued to assert, and so far as I know yet asserts, her right to reduce Texas to obedience, as a part of the Republic of Mexico. According to late intelligence, it is probable that she has agreed upon a temporary suspension of hostilities; but, if that has been done, I presume it is with the purpose, upon the termination of the armistice, of renewing the war and enforcing her rights, as she considers them.

This narrative shows the present actual condition of Texas, so far as I have information about it. If it be correct, Mexico has not abandoned, but preserves in the assertion of her rights by actual force of arms, which, if suspended, are intended to be renewed. Under these circumstances, if the Government of the United States were to acquire Texas, it would acquire along with it all the incumbrances which Texas is under, and among them the actual or suspended war between Mexico and Texas. Of that consequence there cannot be a doubt. Annexation and war with Mexico are identical. Now, for one, I certainly am not willing to involve this country in a foreign war for the object of acquiring Texas. I know there are those who regard such a war with indifference and as a trifling affair, on account of the weakness of Mexico, and her inability to inflict serious injury upon this country. But I do not look upon it thus lightly. I regard all wars as great calamities, to be avoided, if possible, and honorable peace as the wisest and truest policy of this country. What the United States most need, are union, peace, and patience. Nor do I think that the weakness of a Power should form a motive, in any case, for inducing us to engage in or to depreciate the evils of war. Honor and good faith and justice are equally due from this country towards the weak as towards the strong. And, if an act of injustice were to be perpetrated towards any Power, it would be more compatible with the dignity of the nation, and, in my judgment, less dishonorable, to inflict it upon a powerful instead of a weak foreign nation. But are we perfectly sure that we should be free from injury in a state of war with Mexico? Have we any security that countless numbers of foreign vessels, under the authority and flag of Mexico, would prey upon our defenceless commerce in the Mexican gulf, on the Pacific ocean, and on every other sea and ocean? What commerce, on the other hand, does Mexico offer, as an indemnity for our losses, to the gallantry and enterprise of our countrymen? This view of the subject supposes that the war would be confined to the United States and Mexico as the only belligerents. But have we any certain guaranty that Mexico would obtain no allies among the great European Powers? Suppose any such Powers, jealous of our increasing greatness, and disposed to check our growth and cripple us, were to take part in behalf of Mexico in the war, how would the different belligerents present themselves to Christendom and the enlightened world? We have been seriously charged with an inordinate spirit of territorial aggrandizement; and, without admitting the justice of the charge, it must be owned that we have made vast acquisitions of territory within the last forty years.

Suppose G. Britain and France, or one of them, were to take part with Mexico, and by a manifesto, were to proclaim that their objects were to assist a weak and helpless ally to check the spirit of encroachment and ambition of an already overgrown Republic, seeking still further acquisitions of territory, to maintain the independence of Texas, disconnected with the United States, and to prevent the further propagation of slavery from the United States. What would be the effect of such allegations upon the judgment of an impartial and enlightened world?

Assuming that the annexation of Texas is war with Mexico, is it competent to the treaty-making power to plunge this country into war, not only without the concurrence of, but without deigning to consult Congress, to which, by the Constitution, belongs exclusively the power of declaring war?

I have hitherto considered the question upon the supposition that the annexation is attempted without the assent of Mexico. If she yields her consent, that would materially affect the foreign aspect of the question, if it did not remove all foreign difficulties. On the assumption of that assent, the question would be confined to the domestic considerations upon which annexation is proposed. I do not think that Texas ought to be received into the Union, as an integral part of it, in decided opposition to the wishes of a considerable and respectable portion of the Confederacy. I think it far more wise and important to compose and harmonize the present Confederacy, as it now exists, than to introduce a new element of discord and distraction into it. In my humble opinion, it should be the constant and earnest endeavor of American statesmen to eradicate prejudices, to cultivate and foster concord, and to produce general contentment among all parts of our confederacy. And true wisdom, it seems to me, points the duty of rendering its present members happy, prosperous, and satisfied with each other, rather than attempt to introduce alien members, against the common consent and with the certainty of deep dissatisfaction. Mr. Jefferson expressed the opinion, and others believed, that it never was in the contemplation of the framers of the Constitution to add foreign territory to the Confederacy, out of which new States were to be formed. The acquisitions of Louisiana and Florida may be defended upon the peculiar ground of relation in which they stood to the States of the Union. After they were admitted we might well pause awhile, people our vast wastes, develop our resources, prepare the means of defending what we possess, and augment our strength, power and greatness. If hereafter further territory should be wanted for an increased population, we need entertain no apprehensions but that it will be acquired by means, it is to be hoped, fair, honorable, and constitutional.

It is useless to disguise that there are those who espouse and those who oppose the annexation of Texas upon the ground of the influence which it would exert, in the balance of political power between the two great sections of the Union. I conceive that the motive for the acquisition of foreign territory would be more unfortunate, or, at least, with more fatal consequences, than that of obtaining it for the purpose of strengthening one part against another part of the Confederacy. Such a principle, put into practical operations, would menace the existence, if it did not certainly sow the seeds of dissolution of the Union. It would be to proclaim to the world an insatiable and unquenchable desire for foreign conquest or acquisition of territory. For if to day Texas be acquired to strengthen one part of the Confederacy, to-morrow Canada may be required to add strength to another. And, after that might have been obtained, still other and further acquisitions would become necessary to equalize and adjust the balance of political power. Finally, in the progress of this spirit of universal dominion, the part of the confederacy which is now weakest, would find itself weaker from the impossibility of securing new theatres for those peculiar institutions which it is charged with being desirous to extend.

But would Texas ultimately add strength to that which is now considered the weakest part of the Confederacy? If my opinion be correct, it would not. According to that, the territory of Texas is susceptible of a division into five States of convenient size and form. Of these, two only would be adapted to those peculiar institutions to which I have referred, and the other three, lying west and north of San Antonio, being only adapted to farming and grazing purposes, from the nature of their soil, climate and productions, would not admit of these institutions. In the end, therefore, there would be two slave and three free States probably added to the Union. If this view of the soil and geography of Texas be correct, it might serve to diminish the zeal both of those who oppose and those who are urging annexation.

Should Texas be annexed to the Union, the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, be its amount what it may. What it is, I do not know certainly; but the least I have seen it stated at is thirteen millions of dollars. And this responsibility will exist, whether there be a stipulation in the treaty for not expressly assuming the payment of the debt of Texas. For I suppose it to be undeniable that, if one nation becomes incorporated in another, all the debts, and obligations, and incumbrances, and wars of the incorporated nation, become the debts, and obligations, and incumbrances, and wars of the common nation created by the incorporation.

If any European nation entertains any ambitious designs upon Texas, such as that of colonizing her, or in any way subjugating her, I should regard it as the imperative duty of the Government of the United States to oppose to such designs the most firm and determined resistance, to the extent, if necessary, of appealing to arms to prevent the accomplishment of any such designs. The Executive of the United States ought to be informed as to the aims and views of foreign powers with regard to Texas, and I presume that there are any of the exceptional character which I have indicated, the Executive will disclose to the public, the evidence of them. From what I have seen and heard, I believe that Great

Britain has recently formally and solemnly disavowed any such aims or purposes—has declared that she is desirous only of the independence of Texas, and that she has no intention to interfere in her domestic institutions. If she had made such disavowal and declaration, I presume they are in the possession of the Executive.

In the future progress of events, it is probable that there will be a voluntary or forcible separation of the British North America possessions from the parent country. I am strongly inclined to think that it will be best for the happiness of all parties that, in that event, they should be erected into a separate and independent Republic. With the Canadian Republic on one side, that of Texas on the other, and the United States, the friend of both, between them, each could advance its own happiness by such constitutions, laws and measures, as were best adapted to its peculiar condition. They would be natural allies, ready, by co-operations, to repel any European or foreign attack upon either. Each would afford a secure refuge to the persecuted and oppressed driven into exile by either of the others. They would emulate each other in improvements, in free institutions, and in the science of self-government. Whilst Texas has adopted our Constitution as the model of hers, she has, in some important particulars, greatly improved upon it.

Although I have felt compelled, from the nature of the inquiries addressed to me to extend this communication to a much greater length than I could have wished, I could not do justice to the subject, and fairly and fully expose my own opinions in a shorter space. In conclusion, they may be stated in a few words to be, that I consider the annexation of Texas at this time, without the assent of Mexico, as a measure compromising the national character, involving us certainly in war with Mexico, probably with other foreign Powers, dangerous to the integrity of the Union, inexpedient in the present financial condition of the country and not called for by any general expression of public opinion.

In am, respectfully, your obedient servant,
H. CLAY

Mr. Van Buren on Texas.

LANDELWALD, April 29, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR:—Your letter of the 27th of March last, was duly received. Assuming as an unpledged delegate to the Baltimore Convention, you ask my opinion in regard to the constitutionality and expediency of an immediate annexation of Texas to the United States, or as soon as the assent of Texas may be had to such annexation. Upon the receipt of your letter, I caused you forthwith to be informed that your request should be complied with in full season for the convention. This promise I shall now perform. But, lest my motives in making a public avowal of my opinions, whilst a negotiation is supposed to be pending, should be misconstrued, I shall send this to a friend who will delay its delivery as long as that can be done consistently with a faithful compliance with the requirements of your letter, and the general object for which it was written.

You by no means overrate the importance of the subject upon which you have been pleased to address me. It is not only a question of intense interest to every part of the country, but is unhappily also one in regard to which we may not promise ourselves that unanimity in opinions, which is so important when great national questions like this are to be decided. That those which I am about to express will, in at least one important particular, differ from that of many friends, political and personal, whose judgments and parity of views I hold in high and habitual respect, I can well imagine; and it is quite evident, from the tenor of your letter, that they will not in all respects correspond with your own. I, however, such of my fellow-citizens as are neither influenced by prejudices, nor warped by self-interest, concede to my opinions the merit of having been formed under views directed to the preservation and advancement of the honor and best interests of our common country, as a whole, and expressed with a sincerity which has overlooked, as far as our feeble natures will permit us to do, all personal considerations, my most favorable anticipations will be realized.

It has already been my duty to act officially at least two several occasions, but in different forms, upon the subject-matter to which your questions have reference. Having charge of the Department of State in 1820, I prepared, by direction of the President, instructions to our minister at Mexico, by which he was directed to open, without delay, a negotiation with the Mexican government for the purchase of the greater part of the then province of Texas, and by which he was likewise authorized to insert in the treaty a provision similar to that in the Louisiana and Florida treaties, for the incorporation of the inhabitants of Texas into the Union as soon as it could be done consistently with the principles of the federal constitution. The reasons in favor of this measure I stated at large in that document.

In taking this step the administration of President Jackson renewed (but, as was supposed under more favorable circumstances) an attempt to accomplish the same object which had been made by its immediate predecessor. Instructions, similar in their general object, had, in the second year of the latter administration, been sent from the Department of State to the same American minister at Mexico. I am not aware that there were any material differences between them, other than that those of 1827 proposed an acquisition of territory as far west as the Rio del Norte—being, I believe, the extreme western boundary of Texas—whilst the one issued by Pres-

ident Jackson extended only as far west as the centre of the Desert or Grand Prairie, which lies east of the river Nueces; and that, for the former, the payment of one million of dollars was authorized, whilst, by the administration of President Jackson, the American minister was permitted to go as high as four, and, if indispensable, five millions. Both authorized agreements for smaller portions of territory, and the payments were modified accordingly. In respect to the proposed stipulation for the ultimate incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union, both instructions were identical.

In August, 1837, a proposition was received at the Department of State, from the Texan minister at Washington, proposing a negotiation for the annexation of Texas to the United States. This was the first time the question of annexation of a foreign independent State had ever been presented to this government. In deciding upon the disposition that ought to be made of it, I did not find it necessary to consider the question of constitutional power, nor the manner in which the object should be accomplished, if deemed expedient and proper. Both these points were therefore, in terms, passed over in the reply of the Secretary of State to the Texan minister, as subjects the consideration of which had not been entered upon by the Executive.

The first of these—viz: constitutional power—is now presented by your inquiries; nor, however, in precisely the same form. Then the application was for the immediate admission of Texas into the Union as an independent State—your question looks only to its annexation as part of the territory of the United States. There is no express power given to any department of the government to purchase territory except for the object specified in the constitution, viz: for arsenals, &c; but the power has, on several very important occasions, been regarded as embraced in the treaty-making power; and territories have been so annexed with a view and under engagements for their ultimate admission into the Union as States. If there be nothing in the situation or condition of Texas, which would render its admission hereafter into the Union as a new State improper, I cannot perceive any objections, on constitutional grounds, to its annexation as a territory. In speaking of the right to admit new States, I must, of course, be understood as referring to the power of Congress. The Executive and Senate may, as I have already observed, by the exercise of the treaty-making power, acquire territory; but new States can only be admitted by Congress; and the sole authority over the subject, which is given to it by the constitution, is contained in the following provision, viz: "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." The only restrictions imposed upon this general power are, 1st: That no new States shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor, 2ndly, "Any State formed by the junction of two or more States, or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures concerned, as well as of Congress"—restrictions which have no bearing upon the present question. The matter, therefore, stands as it would do if the constitution said "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union," without addition or restriction. That these words, taken by themselves are broad enough to authorize, the admission of the Territory of Texas, cannot, I think be well doubted, nor do I perceive upon what principle we can set up limitations to a power so unqualifiedly recognized by the constitution in the plain simple words I have quoted, and with which no other provision of that instrument conflicts in the slightest degree. But if with no other guides than our discretion, we assume limitations upon a power so general, we are at least bound to give to them some intelligible and definite character. The most natural, and indeed the only one of that nature which has been suggested and which was presented by Mr. Jefferson whilst he entertained doubts in respect to the constitutionality of power to admit Louisiana, is that the new States to be admitted must be formed out of territory, not foreign, but which constituted a part of the United States, at the declaration of independence or the adoption of the constitution. So far from there being any thing in the language of the constitution, or to be found in the extraneous and contemporaneous circumstances which preceded and attended its adoption, to show that such was the intention of its framers, they are, in my judgment, all strongly the other way. In the first place, the articles of confederation, under which the Union was originally formed, and which gave place to the present constitution looked directly to a broader extension of the confederacy. It contained a provision that "Canada, according to the confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of this Union; no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless each admission be agreed to by nine States." The practicability, as well as expediency, of making Canada a member of Union, did certainly, to some extent at least, occupy the minds of our public men, as well before the close of the revolution as between that event and the formation of the new constitution. This is however, only a link in the chain of evidence, to make probable what subsequent events make certain, that the framers of the constitution had their eyes upon this very question, when this section was finally settled. That part of the constitution, as it appears by the journal of the proceedings of the convention was presented in a variety of forms before it assumed the shape in which it was finally adopted.

In the resolutions offered by Mr. Edmund Randolph as a basis for the new constitution, and which contained the first proposition of that character which were submitted to it, the power in question was described as follows, viz: that provision ought to be made for the admission of States lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, whether arising from a voluntary junction of government or otherwise, with the consent of a number of voices in the legislature less than the whole." In Charles Pinkney's draft, it was proposed that "the legislature shall have power to admit new States into the Union on the same terms with the original States, provided two-thirds of the members present in both Houses agree"—leaving out the clause in respect to the character of the territory. Mr. Randolph's proposition, containing the restriction confining the power to States lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, was at one time adopted in Committee of the whole, and, in that State, referred with others to the committee of detail. In a draft of a constitution, reported by that committee, the article upon this subject contained the following proposition: 1st. That new States, lawfully constituted or established within the limits of the United States, might be admitted by the legislature in this government 2d. That to such admission, the consent of two-thirds of the members present in each House should be necessary. 3d. That if a new State should arise within the limits of any of the present States the consent of the legislature of such States should also be necessary to its admission. 4th. That if the admission was consented to the new States should be admitted on the same terms with the original States; and 5th. That the legislature might make conditions with the new States concerning the public debts then subsisting. The 2d, 4th, and 5th clauses were stricken out by the votes of the convention; and after that had been done, the following was adopted as a substitute for the whole, viz: "New States may be admitted by the legislature into the Union; but no new State shall be erected within the limits of any of the present States without the consent of the legislature of such State, as well as of the general legislature"—leaving out that part of the first clause which related to the domestic character of the territory; and this substitute was subsequently revised and amended, so as to make it conform in its phrasing to the section as it now stands in the constitution. These proceedings show that the proposition to restrict the power to admit new States to the territory within the original limits of the United States, was distinctly before the convention, once adopted by it, and finally rejected in favor of a clause making the power in this respect general. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the propriety of referring to extraneous matter to influence the construction of the constitution where its language is explicit, there can certainly be no objections to a resort to such aids to test the correctness of inferences, having no other basis than supposed improbabilities. I have not, therefore, been able to bring my mind to any other satisfactory conclusion than that it was the intention of the convention to give the power of admitting new States to Congress, with no other limitations than those which are specified in that instrument. The language employed, the specifications of certain restrictions the adoption and subsequent exclusion of that which is now referred to, together with the subsequent and continued action of the new government, all seem to combine to render this interpretation of the constitution the true one. Propositions for annexation can certainly be imagined, of a character so unwise and imprudent as to strike the minds of all with repugnance. But if we look over the conceded powers of Congress, we shall also find many others, the abuse of which might involve to an equally great extent, the well being of the republic, and against which abuse the constitution has provided no other safeguards than the responsibilities to their constituents and to the laws of the land, and those whose sanction is necessary to the validity of an act of Congress. Nor is it very unreasonable to suppose that those who based their government upon the great principle that it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new ones, in such forms as they may think most likely to effect their safety and happiness, should feel themselves secure in trusting to their representatives in the House, in the Senate, and in the executive chair, the right to admit new members into the confederacy, with no other restrictions than those which they have thought proper to specify.

It was under this view of the constitution that the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, only fifteen years after the adoption of the constitution, promising the incorporation of the ceded territory into the Union, and the admission, as soon as possible, of the inhabitants to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, was ratified, confirmed, and finally executed by every branch of the federal government whose co-operation is required by the constitution. It is true that Mr. Jefferson, in the interval between the negotiation and submission of the treaty to the Senate, threw out the opinion that the constitution had made no provision for one holding foreign territory nor for incorporating foreign States into the Union. The fact of his approving the treaty, and the laws necessary to its execution, must, however, be regarded as conclusive proof that, upon looking further into the matter, his opinion was changed. The attempt to convince him of his error was made by his friend, Governor Nicholas, as appears by Mr. Jefferson's letters to him and I have but little doubt that, in his letters to Breckinridge and Nicholas had been published in his life time, or his attention been in any other way directed to their contents, he would, from his habitual care in such matters, have avowed the change, and explained the grounds on which it was based. It is equally true that the acceptance of the cession, as well as the admission of the State, became party question, and were contested with partisan warmth. Of the vital importance of that great acquisition to the safety, prosperity, and honor of the whole Union, there can, however, now be no diversity of opinion. But the councils of the nation, in the course of time, ceased to be at all divided upon the question of constitutional power to accept a cession of foreign territory, with a view to its ultimate admission into the Union. In 1819 the Spanish treaty for the cession of East and West Florida, containing the usual stipulation for ultimate incorporation into the Union, was ratified; and, upon the call of the names of the Senators present, it appeared that every one voted for the ratification. Upon the question of constitutional power, so far as that case went, the Senate of the United States had, therefore, become unanimous. Certainly no remarks are necessary to show that there can be no possible difference produced in the constitutional question by the relative positions of the territory comprising Louisiana, the Floridas, and Texas, in respect to the old United States. I have gone thus fully and minutely into this matter, as well from a deep sense of a vast importance of the question, as from a sincere desire to satisfy those of my friends who may differ from me on this point, and whose opinions I hold in the highest respect, that I have not yielded my assent hastily or unadvisedly to the views I have here taken of the subject.

Having thus given you my views upon the constitutional question, I will, with the same frankness answer the remaining portion of your inquiries, viz: the expediency of immediately annexing Texas to the United States, or so soon as her consent to such annexation may be obtained.

I have already referred to an application for the accomplishment of the same object that was made to the government by Texas, whilst I was President. The history of the Texan revolution and then the condition of that republic, as well as the probable advantages to result to both from the proposed annexation, were placed before us in an elaborate and able communication. It can scarcely be necessary to say that the application was considered with that attention and care which were due to so grave a proposition, and under full influence of the feelings of sincere solicitude for the prosperity and permanent welfare of a young and neighboring State, whose independence we had been the first to acknowledge—feelings which constitute, and I sincerely hope ever will constitute the prevailing sentiment of the people of the United States. In coming to the decision which it became my duty to make, I was aided, in addition to the other members of my cabinet, by the counsel and constitutional advice of two distinguished citizens of your own section of the Union, of the first order of intellect, great experience in public affairs, and whose devotion to their own, as well as every other section of the Union, was above all question. The result of our united opinions was announced to the Texan minister, (Gen. Hunt,) in a communication from the late Mr. Forsyth, the substance of which I cannot better express than by incorporating one or two brief extracts from it in this letter. Upon the general subject, my own views as well as those of my cabinet were thus stated:

"So long as Texas shall remain at war, while the United States are at peace with her adversary the proposition of the Texan minister plenipotentiary necessarily involves the question of war with that adversary. The United States are bound to Mexico by a treaty of amity and commerce, which will be scrupulously observed on their part so long as it can be reasonably hoped that Mexico will perform her duties, and respect our right under it. The United States might justly be suspected of a disregard of the friendly purposes of the compact, if the overture of General Hunt were to be even reserved for future consideration, as this would imply a disposition on our part to espouse the quarrel of Texas with Mexico—a disposition wholly at variance with the spirit of the treaty, with the uniform policy and obvious welfare of the United States.

"The inducements mentioned by General Hunt for the United States to annex Texas to their territory, are duly appreciated; but, powerful and weighty as they are, they are light when opposed in the scale of reason to treaty obligations, and respect for that integrity of character by which the United States have sought to distinguish themselves since the establishment of their right to claim a place in the great family of nations."

The intimation in General Hunt's letter that Texas might be induced to extend commercial advantages to other nations to the prejudice of the United States was thus noticed:

"It is presumed, however, that the motives by which Texas has been governed in making this overture, will have equal force in impelling her to preserve, as an independent power the most liberal commercial relations with the United States. Such a disposition will be cheerfully met, in a corresponding spirit, by this government. If the answer which the undersigned has been directed to give to the proposition of General Hunt should unfortunately work such a change in sentiments of that government as to induce an attempt to extend commercial relations elsewhere upon terms prejudicial to the United States, this government will be consoled by the rectitude of its intentions, and a certainty that, although the hazard of transient losses may be incurred by a rigid adherence to just principles, no lasting prosperity can be secured when they are disregarded."

That those views were not altogether satisfactory to General Hunt, nor probably to his government, has been seen. But I think I may safely say that seldom, if ever, has the decision, by this government, of a question of equal magnitude, been more decidedly or more unanimously approved by the people of the United States. The correspondence was, very soon after it took place, communicated to Congress, and although the public mind was at the time in a state of the highest excitement, and the administration daily assailed through every avenue by which it was deemed approachable, I am yet to see the first sentence of complaint upon that point, in any quarter of the Union. Even a resolution offered in the Senate, declaring annexation, "whenever it could be effected consistently with the public faith and treaty stipulations of the United States, desirable," was ordered to be laid upon the table; and a similar disposition was made in the House of the papers upon the subject, which had been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that committee discharged from the further consideration of the matter, upon its own application. Nor were the friendly relations existing between that republic and the United States—to its honor be it said—in any perceptible degree impaired by this decision.

Standing in this position before the country, it becomes my duty to consider whether either the nature of the question or the circumstances of the case, have so far changed as to justify me in now advising a policy from which I then, in the most solemn form, dissented.

In giving to you, and through you to the public, the result of a very careful and dispassionate examination of this grave question, I should neither do justice to yourself, to the patriotic State which you, in conjunction with others, are to represent in the convention, to the people of the United States, nor to my own position, if I failed to accompany it with a brief exposition of the grounds upon which I have proceeded. It is in that way only that justice can be done to my intention; and that is all I desire. The annexation of the territory, and the consequent assumption by us of a responsibility to protect and defend its inhabitants, would in respect to the consideration to which I am about to refer, stand upon the same footing with that of its admission as a State. The recognition of Texas as an independent State, was a measure which received, in various and appropriate forms the sanction of every department of the government, whose co-operation was necessary to its validity, and had my hearty concurrence. From this act of our government, just and proper in all respects as it was, an inference has however, been drawn, and brought to bear upon the present question, not only very far beyond its real bearing but by which its true character is entirely reversed. Many persons who enter upon the consideration of the subject with the purest intentions, and are incapable of knowingly giving a false interpretation to anything connected with it, take it for granted that the United States, in recognizing the independence of Texas, declared to the world, not only that she was independent in fact, but also that she was such of right.

Acting upon this erroneous construction, they very naturally conclude, that having gone thus far, having examined into and passed not only upon the existence of her independence, also upon her right of its enjoyment, it is now (and more especially after the lapse of several years) too late to hesitate upon the question of annexation on the ground of any existing controversy upon those points. The fallacy of this reasoning will be apparent when it is considered that the usage of nations to acknowledge the government, *de facto*, of every country, was established for the express purpose of avoiding all inquiry into, or the expression of any opinion upon, the question of right between the contending parties. They cannot inquire beyond that point without interfering with the internal concerns of other nations—a practice which all disclaim, and a disclaimer which it has been our invariable usage not only to make, but to enforce with scrupulous fidelity. To recognize the independence of the government *de facto*, as also a matter of state necessity; for without it, neither commercial nor diplomatic intercourse between any such power and the nations of the world could be carried on with success, and the social interests of mankind require that these should not be arrested by quarrels between contending parties, in regard to their respective right to the supreme power. In respect to all beyond this, the laws and usages of nations require the observance of a strict neutrality between contending parties, as long as the war lasts. It is due, also, from every government to its own citizens, to declare when a revolted colony shall be regarded as an independent nation. Because "it belongs to the government alone to make the declaration," and because, until it is made, or the parent State relinquishes her claims, courts of justice must consider the ancient state of things as remaining unaltered, and the sovereign power of the parent State over that colony as still subsisting." But nothing can be farther from giving to the act of recognition its true character, than to suppose it has the slightest bearing upon the rights of the parties; it being, as I have already said, resorted to for the express purpose of avoiding any such construction. Such is not only the law and usages of nations, but such also have been the reiterated avowals of our own government. I do not remember that the recognition of Texan independence gave rise to any correspondence between Mexico and our government; and if it did, I have not the means of stating its character. But the principles upon which all such acts are based, were fully set forth by this government upon the occasion of the recognition of the independence of the Spanish American States. In the message of President Monroe, to the House of Representatives, suggesting the propriety of that recognition, it was expressly declared, that in proposing this measure, it was "not contemplated to change thereby, in the slightest manner, our friendly relations with either of the parties; but to observe in all respects, as heretofore, should the war be continued, the most perfect neutrality between them." The Committee on foreign Affairs, in their elaborate report upon the subject, say: "our recognition must necessarily be co-existent only with the fact on which it is founded, and cannot survive it. While the nations of South America are actually independent it is simply to speak the truth to acknowledge them to be so. Should Spain, contrary to her avowed principle and acknowledged interest, renew the war for the conquest of South America, we shall, indeed, regret it; but we shall observe, as we have done between the independent Parties, an honest and impartial neutrality." The Secretary of State, in defence of recognition, said to the Spanish minister: "This recognition is neither intended to invalidate any right of Spain, nor to affect the employment of any means which she may yet be disposed or enabled to use, with the view of reuniting those provinces to the rest of her dominions." That these avowals were in strict conformity to the true principles of the law of nations, there can be no doubt. They were, at all events, those which this government has solemnly announced as its rule of action in regard to contests between rival parties for the supreme power in foreign States. That the admission of Texas as a member of this confederacy, whilst the contest for the maintenance of the independence she had acquired was still pending, and a consequent assumption of the responsibility of protecting her against invasion, would have been a plain departure from the laws and usages of nations, and a violation of the principles to which we had avowed

our adherence in the face of the world, was too clear to be doubted. Thus believing, I had, on the occasion to which I have referred, in the faithful discharge of the trust which the people had reposed in me, but one course to pursue, and that was promptly but respectfully adopted.

I return now to the question, Has the condition of the contest between Texas and Mexico for the sovereignty of the former, so far changed as to render these principles now inapplicable? What is the attitude which these two States at this moment occupy towards each other? Are they at war, or are they not? We cannot evade this question if we would. To enumerate all the circumstances bearing upon it, in a communication like this, would be impracticable; nor is it necessary. In respect to the parties themselves, there would seem to be misunderstanding upon the subject. Mexico has been incessant in her avowals, as well to our government as to others, of the continuance of the war, and of her determination to prosecute it. How does Texas regard her position in respect to the war with Mexico? Three years subsequent to our recognition of her independence, we find her entering into a stipulation with a foreign power to accept of her mediation to bring about a cessation of hostilities between her and Mexico, engaging to assume a million sterling of the debt due from Mexico to the subjects of that power, if she, through her influence, obtained from Mexico an unlimited truce in respect to the war then raging between her and Texas within one month, and a treaty of peace in six. As late as last June, we see a proclamation of the President of Texas, declaring a suspension of hostilities between the two powers during the pendency of negotiations to be entered upon between them, issued on the supposition that a similar proclamation would be issued by Mexico; and actual hostilities are now only suspended by an armistice to be continued for a specified and short period, for the sake of negotiation. Nor are our views on the point less explicit. In the published letter of the late Secretary of State to the Mexican Minister at Washington, written in December last, he says:—"Nearly eight years have elapsed since Texas declared her independence. During all that time Mexico has asserted her right of jurisdiction and dominion over that country, and has endeavored to enforce it by arms." In the President's message to Congress, it is stated "That the war which has existed for so long a time between Mexico and Texas, has since the battle of San Jacinto, consisted for the most part of predatory incursions, which, while they have been attended with much suffering to individuals, and kept the two borders of the two countries in a state of constant alarm, have failed to approach any definite result."

And after commenting with much truth upon the insufficiency of the armistices which Mexico has fitted out for the subjection of Texas—on the length of time which has elapsed since the latter declared her independence—on the perseverance, notwithstanding, in plans of reconquest by Mexico—on her refusal to acknowledge the independence of Texas, and on the evils of border warfare, the message adds: "The United States have an immediate interest in seeing an end put to the state of hostilities between Mexico and Texas;" following up the remark with a forcible remonstrance against the continuance of the war, and a very just and impressive statement of the reasons why it should cease. This remonstrance is, in my opinion, entirely just and perfectly proper. The government of the United States should be at all times ready to interpose its good offices to bring about a speedy, and, as far as practicable, a satisfactory adjustment of this long pending controversy. Its whole influence should be exerted, constantly, zealously and in good faith, to advance so desirable an object; and in the process of time it can, without doubt, be accomplished. But what, my dear sir, is the true and undisguised character of the remedy for these evils, which would be applied by the "immediate annexation of Texas to the United States?" Is it more or less than saying to Mexico, We feel ourselves aggrieved by the continuance of this war between you and Texas; we have an interest in seeing it terminated; we will accomplish that object by taking the disputed territory yourselves; we will make Texas a part of the United States, so that those plans of reconquest, which we knew you are maturing, to be successful, must be made so against the power that we can bring into the contest; if the war to be continued, as we understand to be your design, the United States are henceforth to be regarded as one of the belligerents?

We must look at this matter as it really stands. We shall act under the eye of an intelligent, observing world; and the affair cannot be made to wear a different aspect from what it deserves, if even we had the disposition (which we have not) to throw over it disguises of any kind. We should consider whether there is any way in which the peace of this country can be preserved, should an immediate annexation take place, save one—and that is, according to present appearances, the improbable event that Mexico will be deterred from the farther prosecution of the war by the apprehension of our power. How does that matter stand? She has caused us to be informed, both at Mexico and here, in a manner the most formal and solemn, that she will feel herself constrained, by every consideration that can influence the conduct of a nation, to regard the fact of annexation as an act of war on the part of the United States, and that she will not, notwithstanding, prosecute her attempts to regain Texas, regardless of consequences. Exceptions are, however, taken by the President, and I think very justly taken, to the manner in which this determination has been announced. The Mexican government should certainly have applied in a becoming spirit to ours for explanations of its intention. If it found this government under the impression that Mexico, although it might not be willing to acknowledge its independence, had abandoned all serious hope of reconquering Texas, Mexico should have assured us of our error, and remonstrated against any action on our part based on that erroneous assumption, declared firmly, if it pleased, but in that courteous and respectful manner which is alone suited to the intercourse between nations who profess to be friends, its determination to oppose us. Instead of taking a course, the propriety of which was so obvious, she first assumes, upon grounds which were neither proper nor safe for her to act upon, that this government had designs upon Texas;

then denounces the annexation as a great national crime, and forthwith proclaims instant war as the penalty of our persisting in such an attempt; and all this in language bearing certainly, (although subsequently disavowed,) every appearance of menace.

[CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.]

OXFORD DEMOCRAT.

PARIS, MAY 14, 1844.

"The great popular party is already rallied almost en masse around the banner which is leading the party to its final triumph. The few that still lag will soon be rallied under its ample folds. On that banner is inscribed: FREE TRADE; LOW DUTIES; NO BARTS; SEPARATION FROM BANKS; ECONOMY; REFORM; AND STRICT ADHERENCE TO THE CONSTITUTION. Victory in such a cause will be great and glorious; and if its principles be faithfully and firmly adhered to, after it is achieved, much will it redound to the honor of those by whom it will have been won; and long will it perpetuate the liberty and prosperity of the country."—*Calhoun.*

NATIONAL CONVENTION.

The Democratic National Convention is soon to meet at Baltimore for the purpose of designating those individuals whose wisdom and services best fit them for the two highest offices in this Republic. Duties, therefore, devolve upon the Delegates to this Convention neither few in number, or small in magnitude. It is plainly the duty of every Delegate to vote for a man who has by all his acts been a firm believer in the great Democratic Creed:—One who is acquainted with the wants of the people—one who is anxious to promote and defend the interests of the masses, and secure the rights and privileges of all classes. One who is thoroughly acquainted with our Constitution, and is willing, like Jefferson, to abide by that construction which is in harmony with its spirit and intention,—in fine, one whose ability and talents best qualify him for the independent head of an Independent Nation.

Every Delegate should feel himself bound to vote for that man who has been heretofore, and is now, best fitted to guide this great Republic; whose opinions are just, firm and noble. The present is no time for Patriots to sleep. Foes without and foes within should warn every Democrat to be on the lookout—to be vigilant and active. The man selected for President should possess these qualities in the highest degree. He should be quick to each and all the interests of the Republic. He should know his duty and fearlessly perform it.

The man selected for the Presidency should be independent of cliques, favorites, and pledges; for, be he who he may, if he can be successfully charged with *favoritism*, trickery, and other schemes of the Demagogue, we need not look forward with any degree of hope to his elevation. One candidate selected for this high office has already ventured upon this scheming process, and is at this time rearing up and down the country to influence his own election, against the custom and beneath the dignity of all Presidential Candidates.

The Candidate selected by the Democrats should be a man of great moral strength and power, whose character for truth, consistency, integrity, honor, firmness and sincerity, has never been questioned. Worth makes the man, the world over; and great moral worth adds to the influence and success of a candidate for office. A vacillating, hesitating, provisional and expediency-loving man cannot secure confidence in his opinions, enthusiasm in his support, or respect for his character. Frankness and directness are likewise considered the highest virtues of the citizen. They ought to be esteemed not less highly, as attributes of the Statesman. Let, then, a man be selected whose moral and religious virtues are of the most elevated kind.

A candidate should be selected, at this Convention, who is most likely to succeed. If this country has any hopes of future prosperity and advancement, it must look, to a very great extent, to the policy and principles and principles of the old Republican party. The present Democratic party is the only true representative of those principles. If that party should be defeated in the coming contest, the country will receive a blow from which years of future Republican policy will not recover, or even change it. *Available*, then, should be, and must be one great element in the selection of a candidate for the Presidency.

Finally, the Delegates to the Baltimore Convention should establish, in our opinion, the one term principle. It has long been advocated by many distinguished Democrats, such as Jackson, Calhoun, and others. A vast number in the Democratic party still adhere to and advocate this doctrine. There is now a good opportunity of starting on this principle. Everything is favorable to such a movement. This step once taken, will have a tendency to unite the Democrats of all parties. It will forever silence that mean, cringing, office-seeking, office-making, patronage-lavish spirit, at present so fearfully rife throughout the length and breadth of the land.

In conclusion, we would say, so far as the nomination and result of this Convention is concerned, let our will, but that of the great Republican Family be done. We feel ready and willing to support the candidate selected, if he be any of the distinguished men named by our citizens in different portions of the Union for that office. We do not wish to disguise the feeling, however, that we could fight with greater courage, with more faith, and with greater zeal for some candidates than for others. This, however, should not, as it certainly will not, abate our confidence in the righteousness of our cause, or diminish our hope and ceaseless prayer for victory.

The County Commissioners will be in session Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of this week at the Court House.

There will be a session of the Supreme Judicial Court at this place commencing on Tuesday next. Probate Court the week after.

We intended to have published this week Mr Van Buren's letter on the subject of annexation, but as it is more lengthy than we anticipated, we are under the necessity of postponing a part of it until next week. Our readers will find this letter to be a most able exposition of the Texas question. It is worthy of a careful examination.

DREAUFUL RIOTS AT KENSINGTON, PENN. MANY PERSONS WOUNDED, AND SEVERAL KILLED.

On Monday, a week ago yesterday, a riot occurred at Kensington, being in the suburbs of Philadelphia. The Native American party had met to listen to an Address from Mr. Kramer. He had not proceeded far when a gun was fired, and a general rush made to the spot whence came the report. Volley after volley succeeded, and men came running from all quarters, armed with guns, bludgeons, and stones. The assailants were driven into various houses in the vicinity, and the houses themselves injured, and the furniture broken into fragments.

The riot lasted about one hour, during which time hundreds of reports from fire arms were heard. At least fifty persons fell wounded. Several persons were reported to have been killed. The Native Americans and Irish Catholics have been the parties engaged in these riots.

The next day the riots were renewed. A Philadelphia paper gives the following account of them:—

THREE O'CLOCK P. M.—We have just left the dreadful yet picturesque scene. The market houses are all in flames, and quite a row of brick and frame dwellings whose frightened occupants have fled in all directions for safety and for life. The dark red clouds are lighting up with a horrid glare the blue and quiet sky. Rolls of bright smoke taking fantastic shapes thicken the air while here and there through the dense crowd the flame tongues of living light may be seen licking with fire some new building preparatory to its destruction. In front may be seen congregations of excited men, shouting, talking, arguing, blustering, and tossing their arms in the air with vehement agitation. Beyond on that open space the plumed heads, and glittering swords of the cavalry are waving and glancing in the lurid light, while the heavy tread of men, and the ringing clank of muskets broken the mere presence of the infantry. The adjacent streets are deserted. The houses are close and abandoned. Since the approach of the military all is still, save that here and there the shriek of a child, or the sob of a woman, or the deep oath of a man breaks the solemn stillness.

Dim figures move suspiciously in the shade as if seeking concealment, while wretched looking beings driven from their abodes, homeless and homeless, are stealing off with beds, pillows, chairs and tables upon their shoulders, looking for some distant place of deposit. Hark!—a shot!—a scream!—a rush of soldiers!—and another victim is borne away for surgical assistance. A solitary one horse cart, as we leave, girls, a boy, and an infant all crying. It contains some furniture, and by its side walks a man, who turns back to cast one lingering gaze on the burning pile at hand? and with a groan of intense agony, exclaims, "The toil of twenty years all gone in one moment! My God! I have I deserved this! The cart drove on, and we heard no more. We walked homeward thinking, can it be possible that this is a land of Freedom and laws, a land of Christianity?

TEN O'CLOCK P. M.—We have just learned that an Irish weaver named Joseph Rice, a dweller in some of the houses assaulted in Cadwallader street, but who is said to have taken no part in the contest, as we shot through the head while looking over the fence to see how the riot progressed. We looked at the corpse as it lay mangled on the floor of its late habitation, with none save a weeping widow and two fatherless children, sitting in agony beside it. It was a shocking picture.

A man named John S. Fagan, an American, was shot through the shoulder, the ball coming out of his back. A young man, 22 years of age, named John Shreves, a painter, living Front above Green street, was shot through the head, and instantly killed. He was an American, and had only been married three months. A man named Deal was shot in the arm. About 7 o'clock P. M. a young man returning from his work and passing the scene of action, was badly wounded. A great many others were shot and several killed, whose names we could not ascertain.

The military arrived on the ground about 5 o'clock, P. M. They consisted of the companies of the first brigade, under Gen. Cadwallader. The Sheriff was also on the ground with a small civil posse. As the military approached the market house, they were fired upon from a house on Washington street, but nobody was hurt. Those who fired the gun—some seven or eight Irishmen—precipitately fled, and were not captured. The presence of the military had the effect of restoring almost an immediate quiet.

The military occupied all the vacant ground at the scene of destruction. They were stationed along Master, Cadwallader, and Washington streets, and the Germantown road, with cannon planted at every commanding point. A regular guard was set, and patrolling parties kept in constant motion. About 10 o'clock several of the most active of our fire companies arrived on the ground, and protected by the military went into service, and in about an hour succeeded in arresting the conflagration. They went quietly to work, and did immense execution. They merit all praise.

ELEVEN O'CLOCK.—A few guns are being discharged at intervals in Master street. Military in motion, but no rioters discovered. It is said that from 20 to 30 houses altogether have been consumed, located on Cadwallader, Master, and Washington streets—some large handsome dwellings, but generally poor buildings. Nothing is left of the Market house but the brick pillars, with which the standing chimneys of the dwellings look like blackened monuments of anarchy. It is thought that many dead bodies of the Irish were consumed in the burning houses.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT TO BE HELD ON THE SAME DAY IN ALL THE STATES.—DR. DUNCAN'S BILL.

A bill is now before the Federal House of Representatives, providing for the election of electors of President and Vice President on the same day in all the States of the Union. This bill was introduced by Mr. Duncan, who has made several unsuccessful attempts to bring it under consideration. But however desirable be this bill, however essential to the purity of elections, however imperiously required by the present low condition of political morals, we have no hope of its passage during the present session. A Presidential election is now pending, and many of the politicians, deeply interested in the event, have very few scruples about the means of success; and with full knowledge of existing abuses, and strong hope of profit from them, they cannot be very solicitous about any corrective till the election has passed. And as a new campaign will be planned, and candidates will enter the field for a new contest, so soon as the election now pending is decided, we have no great hope of this bill from the next Congress, unless the people speak plainly to their representatives, and insist on its passage. We therefore call upon the press and the people, throughout the country, to demand this bill immediately; and as one mode of speaking, we call upon the citizens to send their demand in the shape of petitions. We also urge every citizen who corresponds with his Representative or Senator at Washington, to urge upon each the speedy passage of this bill.—Philadelphia Ledger.

We sincerely hope Dr. Duncan's Bill may be passed by this Congress. That something of the kind should be done, there can be no manner of doubt.—As the Ledger says, "let the people and the press throughout the country demand the passage of this Bill immediately. The people owe it to themselves, to their free institutions, to their form of Government, and to their patriotism to defeat the re-enactment of the frauds of '40; and thereby frustrate the powers of darkness." We say let such a Bill be enacted without delay.

VIRGINIA ELECTION.

From the latest returns we learn that the Whigs have made considerable gain in the House of Delegates. The Richmond Enquirer claims two majority on joint ballot, which will secure a Democratic U. S. Senator. The popular vote of Virginia is still in favor of the Democracy by about 1500. Virginia will be true to her Democratic faith the coming fall. The reason of the Spring election terminating as it has, is on account of the qualification of voters. A man in Virginia may vote in as many Counties as he has a freehold. In this way a single individual may vote in a dozen places. Our friends feel confident that Virginia will go right in the fall, because in the Presidential election the freehold qualification will be of no avail.

Mr. Bayly, Dem., is elected in Wise's Congressional District.

Texas Treaty.—We learn by our exchanges that the late Treaty was fraudulently published; or, at any rate, published without authority and against the injunction of secrecy imposed upon matters of this kind. It was first published in the New York Post. A special committee has been appointed by the Senate, of whom Mr. Archer is chairman, to investigate the manner in which the Treaty and other Documents became published. A summons has been sent to Mr. Rogers, publisher of the Post, to make his appearance at Washington. He has accordingly departed for the Capitol.

Insurrection in St. Domingo.—By the arrival of the Sch. Wm. Wilson, at New York, intelligence has been received that the blacks, on the 4th and 5th instants, had risen upon the whites and Mongrel French at Aux Cayes, driven them out, and pillaged the place. The women and children escaped to the vessels in the harbor. After a temporary arrangement, the fugitives again went to their homes. All was confusion and uncertainty.

CHARACTER OF MR. VAN BUREN—WHIG TESTIMONY.

The National Intelligencer, the leading federal paper published at Washington, in an editorial article, published August 26th, 1838, thus speaks of Mr. Van Buren. It is almost unnecessary to say that the Intelligencer at that time, as now, was the open uncompromising opponent of Mr. Van Buren, and was likely to have said nothing more in favor of that distinguished Statesman than what truth forced him to admit.—The extract is from an article advocating the re-election of Mr. Adams to the Presidency:—

"Once more we are obliged, and for this time, reluctantly, to introduce by name to our readers, the Hon. MARTIN VAN BUREN, the distinguished Senator from the State of New York; the 'master spirit,' who can, when he sets himself about it, accomplish more than any other man can dream of. The fascinating address of this distinguished citizen, added to his powers of persuasion, his highly respectable talents, and imperturbable temper, make him not only the most adroit, but also the most powerful politician of the present day. As a gentleman, we have heretofore had occasion to say, we have great respect for him. Even under the greatest excitement of temper, he never forgets the courtesy which becomes him; or, if he does, we have never seen it. IN THE WALKS OF PRIVATE LIFE WE KNOW OF NO EXCEPTION TAKEN TO HIS PRIVATE CHARACTER."

THE ISSUE IN 1844—BANK OR NO BANK—THE SAME AS IN 1832.

"I contend that it is necessary to charter a National Bank, to regulate and control the monetary system, and keep it from explosion and mischief—that a National Bank is necessary to secure a national currency, which is as necessary to a nation as national laws."—Henry Clay's speech at Charleston.

Mr. Clay having accepted the Whig nomination for the Presidency, has refused to be present at any political assemblies hereafter. He ought to have thought of this sooner.

Gov. Dorr has been pronounced guilty by a Rhode Island Jury. Guilty of what? Why, guilty of being an American citizen; and will probably be fined and imprisoned.

Woolen Factory.—Five Woolen Factories are to be put in operation the coming fall in different portions of Maine.

The New England Book and Periodical Company are reminded that we published their Advertisement according to the terms proposed, and that we expect in return the periodical we named, which was the Christian Review, Boston.

A N. Y. Correspondent of the Express says that Mr. Secretary Spencer has resigned his office of Secretary of the Treasury, on account of bad treatment from the President.

AN IMPORTANT MOVEMENT IN VIRGINIA.

At a meeting of the Shockoe Hill Democratic Association of the city of Richmond, held on the evening of May 3, Thomas Ritchie, the veteran and patriotic editor of the Enquirer, offered a series of important resolutions which were agreed to. They are principally devoted to the question of the immediate annexation of Texas.

The last one is as follows:—

"Resolved, that the Democratic Central Committee be requested forthwith to issue an Address to the Democratic Party of Virginia, urging the serious and prompt expression of their opinion on the subject of a re-annexation of Texas to the Union—the propriety of relieving their delegates to the Baltimore Convention from the instructions which now bind them, leaving them, if they deem it expedient to do so, to cast the vote of Virginia in favor of annexation, and of other action which they deem proper and efficient, in uniting the Democracy of the State in the great and vital object of defeating the election of H. Clay."

The Virginia delegates are now instructed to vote for Mr. Van Buren, of whose nomination Mr. Ritchie has been, until the present time, the powerful and uncompromising advocate.

Mr. Ritchie's paper of the same day (May 3,) contains a long article, which is the substance, and appeal to the democracy to drop Mr. Van Buren, lay aside all personal feelings, and go for some candidate more likely to defeat the disastrous pretensions of Henry Clay. The Age.

ANECDOTE OF LA FONTAINE.—It was during the reign of Louis XIV., that a curious meeting took place between La Fontaine, the fabulist, whose meekness and apathy had acquired him the name of "the Good," and an officer. Al though generally blind to the irregularities of his wife, he once took it into his head to become jealous of a captain of dragoons, of the name of Poignant. La Fontaine had not himself observed the intimacy with his wife, but some kind friends had drawn his attention to its impropriety, telling him it was incumbent upon him to demand satisfaction. La Fontaine, reluctantly persuaded, contrary to his usual habits, got up early one morning, took his sword, and went out to meet his antagonist. When the parties were in presence the worthy poet said, "My dear sir, I must fight you, since I am assured that it is absolutely necessary." He then proceeded to acquaint him with the reasons that induced him to call him out, and draw his pacific sword. The dragoon, thus obliged to defend himself, whipped the weapon out of the inexperienced hand of the fabulist, and having disarmed him he proceeded quietly to point out to him the absurdity of the reports circulated in regard to his wife and the folly of having thus exposed his valuable life; adding that since his visits had occasioned scandal, he would from that hour cease to call at his house. Le Bon La Fontaine was so affected by this sincere explanation, that he had not only insisted that the captain should pay more frequent visits than ever but swore that he would fight him over again if he discontinued them.

"STICK A PIN IN THERE."—The Editor of the Rochester Democrat, who has been on a visit to Connecticut, and saw at Birmingham the process of making pins, after detailing some facts about this curious business, thus describes the way in which they are put upon paper. He says:—

"As an instance of the marvellous achievement of skill when so brought to bear upon even one branch of this process, and that quite subordinate the facility for executing the task of sticking the pins upon the sale paper, may be noticed. It takes in England 60 females to stick in one day, by sun light 90 packs consisting of 302,400 pins—the same thing is performed here in the same time by one woman. Her sole occupation is to pour them—a gallon at a time—into a hopper from whence they come out, all neatly arranged upon their several papers! The mechanism, by which the labor of 50 persons is daily saved, yet remains a mystery to all but the inventor: and no person but the single one who attends to it, is, upon any pretext whatever, allowed to enter the room where it operates.

ANOTHER STRIKE. The Philadelphia Times of yesterday says,—"A body of weavers, numbering 495, accompanied by two bands of music, with banners, &c., passed our office yesterday in procession. They are on a strike, we are told, for higher wages. They looked like hard-working, industrious people, and we hope they may be able to accomplish their designs. The poor are terribly oppressed in this direction, and it is time for them to rebel against this worst species of tyranny."

Mr. Jennings of Baltimore, was very hard of hearing, rather given to fits of abstraction, and in the habit of thinking aloud. "Now, you black rascal," said he one day to his nigger, "how do you know I am going to propose to the widow Wadman?" "Why, massa," shouted Caesar in his ear, "I 'spose it's 'cause you so deaf you can't talk to yourself without making cby body else hear."

Veneration. "How do you like that chicken," inquired a veteran caterer in a restaurant, of a customer? "Oh, well," was the reply; "I always venerate old age."

Mr. Van Buren's letter is throughout, able, statesman-like, frank and patriotic, and will add largely to his reputation, as a pure and high minded man.—Age.

PRELINGHUYSEN.—The whigs are very much puzzled to find words to rhyme with the name of their candidate for Vice President. "Pisen" is the only thing approaching to it, that we can think of. Let us see:

It will not pay
To vote for Clay;
And federal pisen
Is Prelinghuyssen.

That's it, precisely.—American.

Love has nothing but beauty to keep it in good health, is short lived, and very apt to have ague fits.

Some writer has beautifully remarked, that beauty in woman is like flowers of spring, but virtue is like the stars of heaven!

The Odd Fellows of Philadelphia recently gave a concert for the benefit of the poor, by which was realized \$222, which was expended for their benefit.

Among the Mexicans it is the fashion to inoculate themselves with the poison of the rattlesnake, which renders them safe from the bite of all venomous animals.

The following was written on the back of a clergyman's marriage fee:

"Hollo, hollo, what's now to pay,
That I so soon am passed away?
The Parson's got me—aye, 'tis true,
For quickly making one from two."

A blooming maiden was married to a gentleman in this city a few evenings ago, and on the same night became the mother of five beautiful and healthy children. Oh, Pie! oh, Dime!—hide our unmarried heads.—Nashville Gazette

In every hill of cucumbers, squashes, and melons, set out one or two onions! This is said to be an 'infallible' remedy for the yellow bug. Try it!

A number of negroes in Columbus, Ohio have commenced the publication of weekly newspaper.

BIRTH.—In North Carolina, the ladies of Chang-Eng, the Siamese twins, of daughters.—They were confined within eight days of each other.

To what color does a flogging change a boy's complexion? It makes him yell O!

The Plebeian Tracts.

NOTICE TO DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATIONS, CLUBS AND COMMITTEES.

In consequence of the increased demand for these popular Tracts, we have reduced the price from \$2.50 to \$2 per 100, and \$20 per 1000. They are now written, and completely explode the sophisms of the modern "Jungles." They should be largely ordered by our Democratic friends throughout the country. No Democrat should be without them. All orders sent to the Plebeian Office, New York City. Remittances in bills of specie-paying banks, accompanying the orders, will be received.

No. 1.—The Injustice of the Tariff on Revenue Principles.

No. 2.—The Injustice of the Tariff on Protective Principles.

LEVI D. SLAMM, Publisher.

READ THIS.

Wright's Indian Vegetable Pills.

THE virtues of these Pills are now cheerfully and universally acknowledged by their great popularity and extensive circulation, and few who peruse this article will be found unacquainted with some proofs of their real excellence, and many will be ready to add the testimonials of their own experience in favor of this delightful medicine.

WRIGHT'S INDIAN VEGETABLE PILLS are designed to ASSIST NATURE in restoring the various organs to a healthy action, by CLEANSING the Stomach and bowels, and PURIFYING the whole System from those morbid and corrupt humors which in most cases are the cause of disease, and thus gives to the patient health for sickness, and cheerfulness for idleness.

The unparalleled success which has attended the use of these Pills has introduced some unprincipled persons to manufacture a SPURIOUS ARTICLE, which they endeavor to palm on the unsuspecting as the GENUINE MEDICINE, hence the importance of purchasing only of the regular advertised Agents. N. B. Remember Thomas Crocker is the only regular authorized Agent for the sale of the above invaluable medicine in this Village, and do not purchase elsewhere, if you would be sure of obtaining the GENUINE MEDICINE.—lat31

DIED.

In Skowhegan, 23th ult, Mr. Luke Withers, in Portland on the 1st inst., Miss Elizabeth M. Andrews, aged 22.

In Bath, Mr. Thomas R. Smith, aged 26 years.

In Norway, Mr. Thomas J. Everett, aged about 40 years.

WATCHES, CLOCKS, & TIME-PIECES

Repaired by B. WALTON, At the BOOK-STORE nearly opposite the Stage-House. Paris-Hill, March 5, 1844. 3w

WANTED.

A S House-keeper, a woman of respectability, thirty or forty years of age. In consequence of the helplessness situation of my wife, also being afflicted with the infirmities of old age, a strong, robust woman is to be desired. My family contains only myself and wife. Any one wishing the situation will please forward a line, with the price per week for their services, to ISAAC HOWE, 344 Greenwood, March 2, 1843.

CAUTION.

THIS may certify that my wife Diana Doble left me on the 22d day of Feb. last, and has fled to part unknown to me, and this is to forbid all persons harboring, hiring, or trusting her on any account, for I will not pay debts of her contracting after this date. Sumner, Feb. 22, 1844. W. D. DOBLE.

WILLIAM K. KIMBALL, ATTORNEY AT LAW, CANTON MILLS, Me.

TREASURER'S NOTICE.—ALBANY.

NOTICE is hereby given to the Resident and Non-Resident Proprietors and Owners of Land in the town of Albany, County of Oxford and State of Maine, that the same are taxed in the town of Albany, and certified list of such as is in the town of Albany, for the years 1842 and 1843, has been returned to me by the Collector of said town for the purpose of advertising, viz:—

RESIDENTS, 1843				Tax.
Names of Owners.	Val.	Acres.	Val.	
Hezekiah Pingree,	10	160	150	\$3.50
Fredrick Westcott,	7	10	150	50
Non-Resident Proprietors—1842 and 1843.				
Loc.	Range.	No. of Acres.	Val.	
Unknown,		6	10	150
do		7	10	160
do		9	160	150
Care of P. Haskell,		12	1	80
Amos Niles, part,		12	1	80
Unknown, part,		12	1	80
HERON CUMMINGS, Treasurer of Albany, Albany, May 10, 1844.				3w1

Notice.—Freedom.

THIS may certify that I have this day given to my son, Asah, F. Moody, his time to not and trade for himself; I shall claim none of his earnings nor pay any debts of his contracting after this date. JOSIAH MOODY.

Attest—G. DANIELS, Hamlin's Grant, May 6, 1844. 3w1

SOUTH PARIS WOOLEN FACTORY.

THE SOUTH PARIS MANUFACTURING COMPANY would respectfully give notice that they continue the custom manufacturing business, and are now prepared to receive Wool to manufacture for customers, at the halves, or at the following rates, viz:—

Casimere, from	35 to 45 cts. per yd.
Fully Cloth,	30 to 37 1/2 per yd.
Satinet, and find warp,	23 to 33 cts. per yd.
Blanketing, over 2 yds wide,	22 to 35 cts. per yd.
White Flannel,	17 cts. per yd.
Colored do	25 cts. per yd.
Colored and pressed,	25 cts. per yd.
Cloth Dressing,	8 to 17 cts. per yd.

A good assortment of the above named cloths will be kept at the Factory, and customers can be supplied with cloths on the delivery of their Wool.

All Wool should be well washed.

If any wool goes out of their hands uncleanly done, they hold themselves accountable for the damage. Thankful to the public for the liberal share of patronage heretofore received, they hope, by their improvement in manufacturing and by despatch of business, for a continuance of their favors. ISAAC HARLOW, Agent.

South Paris, May, 1844. 1f 52

NEW GOODS!!!! HALL & DOW,

HAVE just received and are now opening an extensive assortment of

SPRING GOODS,

which they offer for CASH, at less prices than Goods of the same quality can be bought at any other establishment in this vicinity. They not only have all kinds of WEST INDIA GOODS AND GROCERIES, ENGLISH GOODS AND SILKS, but they also keep on hand all sorts of

DRUGS AND MEDICINES

usually employed by Physicians.

Norway-Village, May 2, 1844. 3w52

FASHIONABLE TAILORING ESTABLISHMENT.

THE subscriber would inform the public that he continues to carry on the Tailoring Business with undiminished success. He would inform those who are in want of Tailoring, that they can have their work done at his Shop in as good style as can be done in Portland. He is constantly receiving the Latest Fashions from Boston and New York.

All garments warranted to fit.—Cutting done at short notice. PETER B. FROST.

Norway-Village, May 2, 1844. 3w52

Corn and Grain.

THE subscriber has on hand and for sale, for cash or good security,

300 bushels of OATS & PEAS;
200 do OATS,
200 do CORN,
50 do RYE.

And a quantity of WHITE BEANS, PEAS and BARLEY.

HENRY HOWE.

Paris Hill, April 25, 1844. 1f 51

Dissolution of Copartnership.

THE Copartnership heretofore existing between the subscribers under the firm of

HUBBARD & MARBLE,

is this day dissolved by mutual consent. All persons indebted to said firm are requested to call on either of them and settle the same immediately.

HIRSHY HUBBARD.

JARVIS C. MARBLE.

Paris, April 6, 1844. 43

NOTICE.

STRAYED from the subscriber, on the 24th of April, a three years old Mare colt of a reddish color, with long mane and tail, white feet, a star in her forehead, and a white stripe on her nose, the mane principally on the left side of her neck. Whoever will return said Colt, or give information where she may be found, shall be handsomely rewarded.

FREEMAN KEEN.

Sumner, May 2, A. D. 1844. 52

NOTICE.

ALL persons are hereby cautioned against purchasing a Note of hand signed by me, and of the following purport, to wit:—Said Note bears date March 6th, A. D. 1844, and payable to Thomas Crocker or order, for the sum of sixty-six dollars and five cents, due on or by the first day of June next with interest, as the same was given without consideration, or value received. SEWALL AYER.

Mexico, April 3d, A. D. 1844. 43

Notice of Foreclosure.

WHEREAS, GEORGE EASTMAN, of Mexico, in the County of Oxford, by his mortgage deed of the 25th day of September, A. D. 1841, conveyed to Benjamin Edmonds of Mexico, after said deed, a certain piece of land, particularly described, in said deed which is recorded in Oxford Registry of Deeds, Vol. 67, page 552, to which reference may be had:—And whereas the said Eastman has failed to perform the conditions of said mortgage, I do therefore claim a foreclosure of the same for default broken, agreeably to the Statute in such case made and provided. BENJAMIN EDMONDS.

May 2, A. D. 1844. 3w63

SAMUEL F. RAWSON, Deputy Sheriff, PARIS HILL, OXFORD COUNTY.

All business by Mail, or otherwise, promptly attended to. Feb. 11 1844. 41

DEPUTY SHERIFF,
FOR THE COUNTIES OF